

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 18, 23, 26, 29, 34, 37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bates et al. (GB 2 336 226 or '226). Claims 3, 5, 6, 8 – 10, 14, 16, 17, 19 – 21, 25, 27, 28, 30 – 32, 36, 38, 39, 41 – 43 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. ('226) in view of Bates et al. (US 5,987,482 or '482).

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview on May 16, 2008. In that telephone interview, the claims as amended and the applied reference were discussed. No agreement was reached.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 45 to better claim the invention. Specifically, applicants have amended the independent claims to specifically state that the browser in which the Web document is displayed has a highlight button which when asserted highlights the embedded links in the document. Support for the added limitations is on page 10, line 25 to page 11, line 2 and highlight links button 420 in Fig. 4.

Applicants further amended Claims 9, 20, 31 and 42 to specify that duplicate links are also displayed in the browser. Support is on page 11, lines 24 – 30.

Since support for the added limitations is in the originally-filed Specification, no new matter is added to the Application.

By this amendment, Claims 1, 3 – 10, 12, 14 – 21, 23, 25 – 32, 34, 36 – 43 and 45 remain pending. For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method of making links that are not easily identified in a displayed Web document by a user to be clearly recognizable comprising:

displaying the Web document in a browser, the Web document having a plurality of embedded links and ***the browser including a highlight button which when asserted highlights the plurality of embedded links in the displayed document;***

enabling the user to assert the highlight button to highlight the plurality of links embedded in the Web document; and

highlighting the plurality of embedded links in the Web document in response to the user asserting the option. (Emphasis added.)

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 as being anticipated by Bates et al. ('226). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bates et al. ('226) teach a fast path location and selection of hypertext links. According to the teachings of Gates et al. ('226), embedded links in the document displayed in a browser are displayed in color with no two adjacent hypertext links having the same color. Just as usual, a user using a slider in a scroll bar of the browser can scroll through the displayed Web document. When a hypertext link embedded in the displayed document is within a user configurable-range of the slider, the hypertext link becomes the current or active link. At that point, the slider will take on the color of the hypertext link to provide a visual cue that the hypertext link within the user-configurable range is the current or active link. Further, the title of the link, as indicated by an HTML tag in the Web page, is displayed at a link display. As long as the slider remains the color of the hypertext link within the range of the slider and the link display shows the title of the hypertext link, the user can select the link by just pressing the right button of the mouse.

But note that Bates et al. ('226) do not teach ***a browser that includes a highlight button which when asserted highlights the plurality of embedded links in the displayed document; enabling the user to assert the highlight button to highlight the plurality of links embedded in the Web document;***
AUS920010875US1

and ***highlighting the plurality of embedded links in the Web document in response to the user asserting the option*** as in the claimed invention.

Therefore, Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Bates et al. ('226). The other independent claims (i.e., independent Claims 12, 23 and 34), which all include the emboldened-italicized limitations in the above-reproduced Claim 1, including their dependent claims, are allowable over as well Bates et al. ('226).

Regarding independent Claim 45, the Examiner asserted that it is unpatentable over Bates et al. ('226) in view of Bates et al. (482). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent Claim 45 include the limitations "enabling user command to highlight the links by asserting a highlight button in the browser, the highlight button being able to toggle on to highlight the links and to toggle off to de-highlight the links."

The Examiner asserted that Bates et al. (482) teach these limitations in col. 7, lines 35 – 57.

Bates et al. ('482) teach a method of displaying hypertext documents with internal hypertext links differentiated from external hypertext links. In accordance with the teachings of Bates et al. ('482), hypertext links may be categorized into external and internal hypertext links. An external hypertext link links together two different documents, while an internal hypertext link links together two different locations within the same document. The method of Bates et al. ('482) displays external hypertext links and internal hypertext links differently to simplify a user's recognition of the external/internal status of each hypertext link in a document. Further, a user may be informed as to whether the location to which an internal hypertext link points is before or after a particular displayed section of the document.

In col., lines 35 – 57, Bates et al. (482) disclose:

FIG. 5 illustrates render document routine 58 in greater detail.

Routine 58 operates in much the same manner as a conventional

rendering routine by executing a loop beginning at block 86 that retrieves each of the display objects at block 88 and then renders each display object at block 98. Routine 58, however, adds an additional step at block 90 to detect and specially handle display objects relating to internal hypertext link definitions.

Whenever a display object for an internal hypertext link definition is detected at block 90, control passes to block 92 to optionally determine whether internal links have been enabled. In particular, a user may be given the option of disabling internal links so that the links may not be navigated, or may not even be shown. This may be performed, for example, by setting the display properties for internal links to be that of the surrounding text such that the links are not highlighted to a user. Also, the selection of internal links may be disabled in the link selection handling routines for the browser. In general, this optional functionality may be desired by some users should they never wish to be informed of internal links within documents. However, it should be appreciated that this function may be omitted in the alternative.

In the reproduced paragraph immediately above, Bates et al. ('482) disclose that an internal hypertext link may be disabled (i.e., de-activated) by a user. A disabled internal hypertext link may not even be shown as a link. A user disables the internal links by (1) setting the display properties for internal links to be that of the surrounding text such that the links are not highlighted to a user or (2) through the link selection handling routines for the browser.

Hence, in the reproduced paragraph above, Bates et al. ('482) do not teach ***enabling user command to highlight the links by asserting a highlight button in the browser, the highlight button being able to toggle on to highlight the links and to toggle off to de-highlight the links*** as in the claimed invention.

AUS920010875US1

Thus, combining the teachings of Bates et al. ('226) with those of Bates et al. ('482) does not teach the claimed invention. Hence, Applicants submit that Claim 45 is also allowable over the applied references.

Consequently, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the application.

Respectfully Submitted

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969